REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated May 22, 2006 has been reviewed, and the comments of the U.S. Patent Office have been considered. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification has been amended, claims 2-5 and 7 have been amended, and claims 8-10 have been added. The amendments to claim 7 are supported in the specification by at least paragraph [0134], and new claims 8-10 are supported in the specification by at least paragraph [0053].

The amendments to the specification at paragraph [0001] update the paragraph with patent numbers corresponding to the identified patent applications. Also, some of the applications identified paragraph [0001] are no longer commonly assigned to the assignee of the above-identified application. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action notes that some of the references of the 12/17/03, 8/25/04, 3/23/05, and 3/21/06 Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs) were not considered because the Examiner did not receive legible copies of certain foreign and non-patent references identified therein. The record available on PAIR indicates that there does not appear to be any deficiency with the 3/23/05 IDS.

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that independent claims 2-5 do not recite the technical features necessary for achieving the recited result. By this Amendment, claims 2-5 are amended to recite some of the structure recited in claim 1 (which is structure that was <u>not</u> rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 in the Office Action). It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,216) in view of Mongeau (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,295) and further in view of a document identified as "UQM Technologies." The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claims 1-5, Li fails to show or describe a vehicle with at least one electric motor, the at least one motor including a multiphase machine having stator core

elements of one group being structurally and electromagnetically isolated from stator core elements in another group

The Office Action at pages 4-5 asserts that Li at Figs. 8-10 shows groups of stator cores being structurally and electromagnetically isolated. However, Li at Fig. 8 shows that a misidentified "rotor" 3B is a <u>single-piece structure</u> with a number of T-teeth 31B formed on its inner side with each holding an electromagnet. *See* Li at col. 4, lines 22-25. Li thus does not show or describe groups of stator cores that are structurally isolated from other groups.

Li at Fig. 8 also shows that "rotor" 3B is formed of magnetically continuous structure because it is made of "a stack of silicon steel plates." See Li at col. 4, lines 22-25. Li thus does not show or describe groups of stator cores that are electromagnetically isolated from other groups.

With regard to independent claim 6, Li fails to show or describe electromagnetic circuits that are sufficiently isolated so that electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits is substantially eliminated. As described above, the Li motor is not electromagnetically isolated and, therefore, also fails to show or describe electromagnetic circuits that are isolated from electromagnetic interference between circuits.

With regard to independent claim 7, Li fails to show or describe a vehicle having at least one electric motor having a motor control scheme that can be <u>dynamically adapted</u> to user inputs, machine operating conditions and machine operating parameters to <u>form an adapted control scheme</u>. The Office Action asserts that the Li vehicle would necessarily have a control scheme in the operation of processor MPU. However, Li fails to show or describe a motor control scheme being dynamically adapted to form an adapted control scheme.

Mongeau fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies in Li. Furthermore, UQM Technologies does not qualify as prior art as acknowledged by the Patent Office at page 9 of the May 24, 2006 Office Action for co-pending application No. 10/359,305. Specifically, Applicants claim priority to provisional application No. 60/399,415 filed July 31, 2002. UQM Technologies bears a date of September 17, 2002, which is after Applicants' provisional priority date of July 31, 2002. Accordingly, UQM Technologies does not qualify as prior art.

Docket No. (AMENDED): 76897-018CIP3 Application No. 10/736,896

Page 10 of 11

For the foregoing reasons, Li and Mongeau, alone or in combination, fail to show or describe all of the features recited in independent claims 1-7, as a whole. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because Mongeau fails to teach or suggest the features missing from Li, and because the rejection relies on a reference that does not qualify as prior art. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to new claims 8-10, these method claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1-7.

Docket No. (AMENDED): 76897-018CIP3
Application No. 10/736,896
Page 11 of 11

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of this Application and the prompt allowance of pending claims 1-10.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution of the application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-3840. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2006
Patent Administrator
Proskauer Rose LLP

1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Suite 400

Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: 202,416,6800 Facsimile: 202,416,6899 CUSTOMER NO: 61263 David W. Laub
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 38,708

Customer No. 61263